

REMARKS

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract of the Disclosure

Applicants have amended the Specification and the Abstract of the Disclosure by replacing a typo word “fixed” by the word “flexible” throughout the application.

II. Status of the claims

Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of claims 4, 5, and 9 and deleting HWW-MDPE related terms. Claims 4-9 have been therefore cancelled. Claim 12 has been amended and made depending from claim 1. Claims 15-19 and 22 have been therefore cancelled.

By entering this amendment, claims 1-3, 10-14, 20 and 21 remain for consideration. No new matter has been introduced because all claim amendments find support from the original claims.

III. Response to the Examiner’s Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Williams et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,355,733). According to the Examiner, the ‘733 patent disclosed films made from a blend of LLDPE (linear low density polyethylene) and HWM-MDPE (high molecular weight, medium density polyethylene) and it therefore anticipates original claim 1. Original claim 5 was rejected because it depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 by deleting the terms relating to HMW-MDPE. Further, claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of original claims 4, 5, and 9. Amended claim 1 is therefore not anticipated by the ‘733 patent because the reference does not teach a thin film (0.5 mil or less) made from a blend of LLDPE and HMW-HDPE.

The Examiner has also rejected original claims 1-8, 10-18 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Williams (U.S. Pat. No. 6,613,841). As discussed

above, Applicants have amended claim 1 by incorporating the limitation of claim 9. Note that original claim 9 was not rejected. Amended claim 1 is therefore not anticipated by the '841 patent. Claims 4-9 have been cancelled. Remaining claims 2, 3, 10, and 11 are not anticipated because they depend from amended claim 1. Applicants have also made claim 12 depending from claim 1. Amended claim 12 and its dependent claims 13, 14, 20 and 21 are therefore not anticipated by the "841 patent.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected original claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the '733 patent. As discussed above, amended claim 1 limits the claimed process to the preparation of a thin film (0.5mil or less) made from a blend of LLDPE and HWM-HDPE. Amended claim 1 is not obvious in view of the '733 patent because the reference does not teach or suggest making a thin film by using a flexible internal orientation device from a blend of LLDPE and HWM-HDPE. In this rejection, the Examiner also expressed concerns about the term "about" in original claims 9 and 19. Applicants have deleted the word "about" when they incorporate the original claim 9 into claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of remaining claims 1-3, 10-14, 20 and 21. Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to phone their attorney, Shao-Hua Guo, at (610) 359-6059 if a discussion of the application might be helpful.

Respectfully submitted,
Paula L. Nygard et al.

By: Shao-Hua Guo

Shao-Hua Guo
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,728
Lyondell Chemical Company
Phone: (610) 359-6059
01/04/2005
Customer Number: 24114